

# HATE CRIME IN THE 1980'S: A DECADE OF BIGOTRY

A Report to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
February 1990

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 18 1991

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations  
320 West Temple Street, Suite 1184, Los Angeles, CA 90012



91 00195

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Peter F. Schabarum, Chairman  
Kenneth Hahn  
Edmund D. Edelman  
Deane Dana  
Michael D. Antonovich

First District  
Second District  
Third District  
Fourth District  
Fifth District

Commission on Human Relations

Ray Bartlett, President  
Minnie Lopez Baffo, Vice President  
Eleanor R. Montano, Vice President  
Hay Yang, Vice President  
Rev. Paul G. Jochenk, Secretary

Rev. Msgr. William J. Barry  
Vito Cannella  
Albert DeBlanc  
Morris Kight  
Melanie E. Lomax

Dr. John R. Phalen  
James M. Riewer  
Patricia Russell  
Rabbi Martin Ryback  
Catherine G. Stern

Eugene S. Mornell, Executive Director

Acknowledgments

Staff Senior Consultant Bunny Nightwalker Hatcher prepared this report, with assistance from Staff Consultant Bobbi Kimble. Clerical support was provided by Pauline Jacobson. The report was under the overall supervision of Assistant Executive Director Roger Ragan.



Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations

Summary of Hate Crime in the 1980's

- \* Hate crime levels rose significantly during the 1980's, culminating in record levels in 1989.
- \* Jews were the targets of the vast majority of religiously motivated hate crimes during the decade, while Blacks were the primary targets of hate crimes motivated by race.
- \* Between 1980 and 1990, diversity of both racial and religious targets increased. By the end of the decade, 18 religious and 7 racial groups had been affected by hate motivated attacks.
- \* Although hate crime based on sexual orientation has been documented for only two years, the high levels during this period indicate that it may be significantly underreported.
- \* Ethnic demographic change played a significant role in the hate crimes perpetrated upon Latinos, Asians, and other immigrants, while international events were more likely to be a factor in hate crimes affecting Arabs and Middle Easterners.
- \* All geographic regions of the County, from the Antelope, San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys to the Westside, South Bay, East County, and Central City, were affected by hate crime in the 1980's.
- \* Throughout the decade, residences were the most frequent site of all categories of hate crime.
- \* Graffiti vandalism was the most common expression of racial and religious bigotry throughout the decade, but the level of hate-related assaults rose dramatically during the last years of the 1980's, especially those aimed at people of color and at Gay men.
- \* As the decade progressed, more law enforcement agencies and community organizations adopted the Commission's reporting criteria for hate crimes.
- \* An increasing number of hate crimes have been solved by arrests in recent years.
- \* Improved reporting from all sources contributed in part to the increase in hate crimes recorded by the Commission. However, the Commission and other agencies involved with hate crime believe that the number of hate crimes committed in the County has continued to escalate during the 1980's.
- \* The Commission believes that, with the support of elected officials, law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and people of good will, the bigotry that leads to hate crime can be replaced by intergroup respect and harmony.

Summary of the Case

- 1. The subject, [Name], was born [Date] in [Location]. He is a [Nationality] and has been residing in [Location] since [Date].
- 2. The subject was arrested on [Date] at [Location] by [Agency]. He was charged with [Charge] and is currently being held in [Location].
- 3. The subject has been in custody since [Date] and has not been interviewed by [Agency]. He has been provided with [Food/Drugs/Exercise] and is in good health.
- 4. The subject has been assigned to [Cell Number] and is being guarded by [Guard Name]. He has been given [Access to Phone/Books/Other Items].
- 5. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].
- 6. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].
- 7. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].
- 8. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].
- 9. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].
- 10. The subject has been interviewed by [Interviewer Name] on [Date] and [Date]. He has provided the following information: [Information].

Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations

Hate Crime Recommendations in the 1980's

In many of its annual hate crime reports issued during the past decade the Commission has made recommendations for action by the Board of Supervisors in order to alleviate the problem of hate crime. Significant recommendations offered by the Commission during the 1980's urged the Board of Supervisors to:

1. Take a strong stand condemning hate crime and the bigotry upon which it is based.
2. Encourage community programs designed to combat hate crime.
3. Urge all law enforcement agencies in the County of Los Angeles to refer hate crime victims to the Human Relations Commission, local fair housing council, or other appropriate service agencies for support services.
4. Encourage the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools to assist school districts in teaching about bigotry.
5. Urge law enforcement agencies and the District Attorney to file and prosecute hate crimes as felonies whenever applicable, and to otherwise prosecute to the full extent of the law.
6. Endorse the 38 recommendations made by the State Attorney General's Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence in its April 1986 Final Report.
7. Urge all law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County to develop hate crime policies and procedures, to maintain separate hate crime records, and to report these crimes to the Human Relations Commission.
8. Publicly commend those law enforcement agencies which have adopted hate crime policies and procedures, and which have aggressively pursued hate crime perpetrators.
9. Urge the enactment of various State and Federal laws related to hate crime reporting, hate crime penalties, and hate crime remedies.
10. Direct the Commission to convene a Countywide Hate Crime Task Force, consisting of representatives of law enforcement agencies, District Attorney, Public Defender, Victim-Witness Assistance Program, Probation Department, and the City of Los Angeles to develop uniform hate crime criteria, policies, and procedures.

The Board of Supervisors approved all of these recommendations.

It is the policy of this journal to publish only original research articles of high scientific value. The editor reserves the right to reject any manuscript that does not meet this standard. The journal is not responsible for the return of manuscripts not accepted for publication.

1. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

2. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

3. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

4. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

5. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

6. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

7. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

8. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

9. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

10. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

11. The author of an original article is responsible for the accuracy of the data and the validity of the conclusions. The editor reserves the right to request additional information or to reject the article if the author fails to provide it.

12. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to the editor. The author should retain a fourth copy as a backup. The editor will not be responsible for the loss or damage of manuscripts.

For more information, contact the editor at the American Medical Association.

# Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations

## Chronology of Major Hate Crime Activity, 1980-89

### 1980

Commission receives numerous complaints about Klan activity in the area and conducts investigations, resulting in release of Under the Hood: A Report on the Ku Klux Klan in the Greater Los Angeles Area.

Community members contact the Commission reporting 26 acts of anti-Jewish bigotry. Commission staff begins documenting individual incidents.

### 1981

Commission conducts outreach into Black, Latino, and Asian communities, urging racial hate crime victims to report incidents to the Commission and law enforcement.

Commission releases its first report to the Board of Supervisors on religious hate crime.

### 1982

Commission releases its first report to the Board of Supervisors documenting both religious and racial hate crime.

Commission convenes first meeting of the Network Against Hate Crime, consisting of representatives of ethnic, religious, government, and fair housing organizations.

### 1983

Commission develops hate crime criteria for widespread use by law enforcement and community organizations.

### 1984

Attorney General establishes a Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence, chaired by Los Angeles County Commissioner Msgr. William J. Barry.

Commission receives National Association of Counties Achievement Award for its racial and religious violence reduction program.

### 1985

Commission publication on how to combat acts of bigotry is distributed to all County and local government officials.

## 1986

Commission holds County-wide training seminar for law enforcement agencies on detecting and responding to hate crimes, urges separate tracking and emphasis on victim support services.

Final report released by the Attorney General's Task Force on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence finds that "hate violence poses a serious threat to California communities" and that there is a lack of legal and social resources and remedies available to hate crime victims.

## 1987

Commission begins tracking anti-Gay and Lesbian hate crime.

Commission convenes first meeting of the County Hate Crime Task Force, established by the Board of Supervisors upon the Commission's recommendation. Participants include, among others, representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff, District Attorney, Public Defender, and Probation Department, and from the Office of the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Police Department, the Victim/Witness Assistance Program, and the Los Angeles County Police Chief's Association.

## 1988

Commission is only government agency asked to testify before Congress on hate crime.

County Hate Crime Task Force develops recommended policies and procedures for law enforcement handling of hate crimes. Guidelines are sent to all police chiefs in the County.

## 1989

Commission releases report on survey of hate crime in the schools, conducted in conjunction with the County Office of Education. Over 60 percent of 1,570 schools respond. Nearly one-third report incidents of hate crime on their campuses, more than 2,200 incidents in all.

Legislature passes, and Governor signs, a bill requiring Statewide reporting of hate crime.

## 1990

Commission releases 1989 hate crime report, documenting highest number of incidents ever, 167 based on race, 125 based on religion, and 86 based on sexual orientation. The 90 arrests in 1989 are also significantly high, more than three times the number in any previous year.

House of Representatives and Senate pass Federal hate crime reporting bills, which now must be reconciled and signed by the President.

## Table of Contents

I.	Historical Overview.....	1
II.	Criteria.....	3
II.	Religiously Motivated Hate Crime.....	4
	Targets of Religious Hate Crime.....	5
	Sites of Religious Hate Crimes.....	6
	Manifestations of Religious Bigotry.....	8
IV.	Racially Motivated Hate Crime.....	9
	Targets of Racial Hate Crime.....	9
	Sites of Racial Hate Crimes.....	10
	Manifestations of Racial Bigotry.....	12
V.	Sexual Orientation Hate Crime.....	13
	Sexual Orientation of Victims.....	13
	Sites of Sexual Orientation Hate Crimes.....	13
	Types of Sexual Orientation Hate Crime.....	14
VI.	Hate Crime Trends in the 80's.....	14
VII.	The Future: Hate Crime in the 90's.....	16



## LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS

### HATE CRIME IN THE 1980'S: A DECADE OF BIGOTRY

#### I. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

It has been ten years since the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations instituted its hate crime monitoring, response, and reporting efforts. During the past decade, the program has increased greatly in scope, and has become a model for others. Today it is regarded as one of the nation's most comprehensive hate crime programs.

Ironically, the Commission did not start out to track hate crime; rather, it set out to track hate groups. In 1980 the Commission received numerous complaints about Ku Klux Klan activity in the County, creating concern about a potential increase in intergroup tension and conflict. Staff investigated the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and other hate groups, and in November 1980 released the results of this investigation in a report, Under the Hood: A Report on the Ku Klux Klan in the Greater Los Angeles Area.

The report resulted in numerous phone calls to the Commission from victims of hate crimes, who frequently believed that the Klan or other hate groups were the perpetrators. Thus, Commission staff again set out to gather information, this time about the relationship between hate groups and hate crime.

The Commission's investigation yielded few links between hate groups and the acts of bigotry which plagued the residents of Los Angeles County. It did, however, result in reports of 26 hate crimes which occurred in 1980. All of these acts reported to the Commission in that year were directed at Jews, and they included graffiti and property vandalism, arson, and criminal threats.

Following the January 1981 release of its report on religiously motivated hate crime, the Commission instituted a program specifically aimed at gathering information about hate crimes afflicting Blacks, Latinos, and Asians. It also convened a Network Against Hate Crime, consisting of representatives of ethnic, religious, governmental, and fair housing organizations, to share hate crime information and develop preventive strategies.

Despite these efforts, only four racially motivated hate crimes were reported to the Commission in 1981, compared to 61 such acts motivated by religious bigotry. However, over the next few years, information about the Commission's hate crime program spread in various ethnic communities, and more victims came forward to report their victimization.

Hate crimes rose slightly in the early part of the decade, then appeared to decline somewhat and level off. However, in 1986, the Commission noted a significant increase in the number of these acts of bigotry, and this trend has, unfortunately, continued unabated as we enter the 1990's.

Racially and religiously motivated hate crime levels for the 1980's are shown in the chart below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Racial Hate Crimes</u>	<u>Religious Hate Crimes</u>
1980	N/A	26
1981	4	61
1982	15	101
1983	11	81
1984	13	70
1985	13	71
1986	58	95
1987	79	115
1988	95	111
1989	167	125

The Commission believes that some of the increase in hate crime is the result of better reporting. The Commission's hate crime program has become better known, and more community organizations, law enforcement agencies, and victims themselves now report hate crimes. However, the Commission also believes that such crimes are increasing.

Recognizing the growing severity of the problem, the Commission, after requesting a directive from the Board of Supervisors, convened a County-wide Hate Crime Task Force in 1987. This body consists of representatives of law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, and other governmental organizations. The Task Force's charge was to develop uniform reporting criteria for hate crimes, and model law enforcement policies and procedures for identifying and responding to hate crimes.

This work was completed in 1988, and the materials developed by the Task Force were sent to all police chiefs in the County by Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich.

The Commission has recently learned that these criteria, policies, and procedures have been adopted by the State's Peace Officers' Standards and Training (POST) office, and will now be used uniformly on a Statewide basis.

Also in 1988, the Commission began gathering statistics on hate crime based on sexual orientation. "Gay bashing," as these attacks are often called, had become increasingly prevalent in the County in the mid-to-late 1980's. The Commission, with the assistance of the Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center, began to receive reports on these acts. In 1988, the Commission documented 61 sexual orientation hate crimes, and that number rose to 86 in 1989.

Anecdotal evidence indicated to the Commission that school age hate crime victims were not being identified. This led to the Commission's 1989 joint effort, with the County Office of Education, in conducting a survey of hate crimes committed on the campuses of schools throughout the County. Over one third of all responding schools reported the occurrence of more than 2,200 campus hate crimes and hate-related incidents during the 1988-89 school year. (See Intergroup Conflict in Los Angeles County Schools: Report on a Survey of Hate Crime, October 1989.)

Thus, throughout the decade, the Commission continually expanded its network of hate crime reporting contacts, beginning with religious and ethnic organizations and fair housing councils, and adding law enforcement agencies, Gay and Lesbian organizations, and educational institutions over time. The Commission believes that this ongoing expansion continues to enhance the accuracy of its annual hate crime reports.

The Commission regards the Statewide adoption of its hate crime criteria as a significant achievement. With law enforcement agencies and community based organizations using uniform definitions, hate crime is now recognized as a distinct crime category. With this distinction has come better identification of hate crimes, and a more sensitive response to the victims.

## II. CRITERIA

Hate crimes are defined as criminal acts, directed at an individual, institution, or business expressly because of race, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation. Definitive guidelines for hate crime determination are as follows:

1. The hate crime must involve a specific target, such as an individual, residence, house of worship, religious or ethnic organization, or business.
2. Graffiti must be racial, ethnic, religious, or homophobic in nature, such as a swastika, KKK, Nazi, or other hate group symbols or slogans, or involve the use of epithets.
3. Bigotry must be the central motive for the attack, rather than economics, revenge, etc., as in other types of crime.
4. A specific victim name, location, and description of the hate crime must be on file with a law enforcement agency or other organization handling the complaint.
5. Any assault against a person, in the absence of other apparent motivation, when initiated with racial, ethnic, religious or homophobic slurs, will be considered a hate crime.
6. Vandalism to a house of worship, or ethnic, religious, or Gay and Lesbian organization, will be considered a hate crime in the absence of evidence of other motives.
7. Obscene or threatening phone calls, when containing racial, ethnic, religious or homophobic slurs, are considered hate crimes.

Although the following are of concern because they may reflect intergroup tension, they are not considered hate crimes because they are not aimed at a specific target.

1. Graffiti on freeway overpasses, public phone booths, etc.

2. "Punk rock" or gang graffiti, even including swastikas.
3. Interracial crimes, such as robbery, assault, or rape, which are motivated by factors other than race, ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation.
4. Intragroup acts, regardless of graffiti; this includes gang graffiti and other gang acts.
5. Name calling and epithets, not accompanied by assault, widespread among youth, are not hate crimes.
6. KKK, Nazi, or other hate group rallies, leafletting or recruiting, though reprehensible, are not hate crimes.

### III. RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME

Religiously motivated hate crimes were the first such acts reported to the Commission, and the Commission has compiled ten years' data on these incidents.

#### The Targets of Religious Hate Crime

In the earliest years, the Commission received reports only of religious hate crimes directed at Jews. The most likely reason for this is that the historical legacy of anti-Semitism has accustomed the Jewish community to report such acts to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and other defense organizations. Despite the victimization of individuals and institutions of other faiths in recent years, Jews continue to account for the vast majority of religiously motivated hate crime victims.

It was not until 1985 that the first non-Jewish religious hate crimes were reported to the Commission, and these were primarily aimed at Muslims. Events in the Middle East seemed to be the most significant factor in the provocation of these attacks. In fact, there appeared to be a direct link between news reports of ongoing hostage situations and attacks on Mosques. One anti-Catholic incident was also reported during 1985.

In ensuing years religious victim diversity continued to grow, as the Commission documented hate crimes against Jews, Muslims, Catholics, Methodists, Mormons, Presbyterians, Unity Church, and Ahimsa faith members, non-denominational Christians, Jehovah's Witnesses, Baptists, Bible Church members, Seventh Day Adventists members of the Church of Christ and Church of the Gabriels, Episcopalians, and Buddhists.

The following chart provides a breakdown of all religiously motivated hate crimes recorded by the Commission during the 1980's. It indicates all 18 faiths targeted, and the percentage of hate crimes suffered by each faith.

RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

RELIGION	1980 (%)#	1981 (%)	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Jewish	26 (100.0)	61 (100.0)	101 (100.0)	81 (100.0)	70 (100.0)	59 (83.1)
Islamic	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	11 (15.5)
Catholic	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.4)
Methodist	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Christian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Jehovah's Witness	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Baptist	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Bible Church	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Buddhist	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Mormon	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Presbyterian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Unity	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Ahimsa	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Church of Christ	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Church of Gabriels	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Episcopal	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Pentecostal	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Seventh Day Adventist	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
TOTAL	26 (100.0)	61 (100.0)	101 (100.0)	81 (100.0)	70 (100.0)	71 (100.0)

RELIGION	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Jewish	78 (82.1)	98 (85.2)	100 (90.1)	110 (88.0)	784 (91.7)
Islamic	8 (8.3)	3 (2.6)	2 (1.8)	1 (0.8)	25 (2.9)
Catholic	2 (2.1)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.8)	7 (5.6)	14 (1.6)
Methodist	1 (1.1)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.8)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.6)
Christian	0 (0.0)	2 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.6)	4 (0.5)
Jehovah's Witness	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	2 (1.6)	4 (0.5)
Baptist	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	2 (1.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.4)
Bible Church	0 (0.0)	3 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.4)
Buddhist	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.6)	2 (0.2)
Mormon	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.2)
Presbyterian	2 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)
Unity	2 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)
Ahimsa	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Church of Christ	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Church of Gabriels	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Episcopal	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Pentecostal	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Seventh Day Adventist	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
TOTAL	95 (100.0)	115 (100.0)	111 (100.0)	125 (100.0)	856 (100.0)

# All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

## Sites of Religious Hate Crimes

The majority of religious hate crimes reported to the Commission in 1980 were directed at synagogues. But residences, businesses, schools, religious organizations, and cemeteries were also the scenes of several incidents.

However, by 1981 residences were the most frequent hate crime site, and have remained so throughout the decade. The other sites mentioned above also continued to be targeted nearly every year until 1985, when hate crimes were first reported in public places.

While hate crimes perpetrated upon houses of worship or other, more public places may affect a greater number of persons, the residential hate crimes appear to have a much stronger impact on the victims, who have expressed feelings of being violated, and rank second only to assault victims in their professed fearfulness.

The chart below shows the sites of all religious hate crimes documented by the Commission in the 1980's:

### RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

TARGET/SITE	1980 (%)§	1981 (%)	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Residence/Auto	1 ( 3.8)	27 ( 44.3)	47 ( 46.5)	47 ( 58.0)	37 ( 52.9)	32 ( 45.1)
House of Worship	12 ( 46.2)	7 ( 11.5)	14 ( 13.9)	14 ( 17.3)	12 ( 17.1)	12 ( 16.9)
Business	6 ( 23.1)	9 ( 14.8)	20 ( 19.7)	11 ( 13.6)	10 ( 14.3)	13 ( 18.3)
School	4 ( 15.4)	9 ( 14.8)	14 ( 13.9)	4 ( 4.9)	8 ( 11.4)	9 ( 12.7)
Religious Organization	1 ( 3.8)	6 ( 9.8)	3 ( 3.0)	2 ( 2.9)	1 ( 1.4)	2 ( 2.8)
Cemetery/Mortuary	2 ( 7.7)	2 ( 3.2)	3 ( 3.0)	3 ( 3.7)	2 ( 2.9)	0 ( 0.0)
Public Place	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.6)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 4.2)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26 (100.0)</b>	<b>61 (100.0)</b>	<b>101 (100.0)</b>	<b>81 (100.0)</b>	<b>70 (100.0)</b>	<b>71 (100.0)</b>

TARGET/SITE	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Residence/Auto	43 ( 45.3)	54 ( 47.0)	64 ( 57.7)	73 ( 58.4)	425 ( 49.6)
House of Worship	24 ( 25.2)	39 ( 33.9)	18 ( 16.2)	21 ( 16.8)	173 ( 20.2)
Business	13 ( 13.7)	9 ( 7.8)	20 ( 18.0)	13 ( 10.4)	124 ( 14.5)
School	9 ( 9.4)	4 ( 3.5)	4 ( 3.6)	9 ( 7.2)	74 ( 8.6)
Religious Organization	4 ( 4.2)	8 ( 6.9)	4 ( 3.6)	5 ( 4.0)	36 ( 4.2)
Cemetery/Mortuary	1 ( 1.1)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	13 ( 1.5)
Public Place	1 ( 1.1)	1 ( 0.9)	1 ( 0.9)	4 ( 3.2)	11 ( 1.4)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95 (100.0)</b>	<b>115 (100.0)</b>	<b>111 (100.0)</b>	<b>125 (100.0)</b>	<b>856 (100.0)</b>

§ All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

All areas of the County were affected by religious hate crime in the 1980's, from the high desert and East County to the South Bay and the Westside.

Over 70 percent of the decade's hate crimes occurred in the Third and Fifth Supervisorial Districts. These Districts include the Fairfax District and the San Fernando Valley, both of which have large, visible Jewish populations. Nearly 92 percent of the decade's religiously motivated hate crimes were directed at Jews, and it is logical that such acts were concentrated in these areas.

Religiously motivated hate crimes occurred in the County's five Supervisorial Districts as follows:

#### RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

SUP. DIST.	1980 (%)*	1981 (%)	1983 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
First Dist.	4 ( 23.1)	1 ( 1.6)	4 ( 4.0)	5 ( 6.2)	8 ( 11.4)	6 ( 8.5)
Second Dist.	2 ( 7.6)	8 ( 13.1)	8 ( 7.9)	6 ( 7.4)	3 ( 4.3)	5 ( 7.0)
Third Dist.	8 ( 30.8)	30 ( 49.2)	37 ( 36.6)	45 ( 55.5)	28 ( 40.0)	29 ( 40.8)
Fourth Dist.	0 ( 0.0)	5 ( 8.2)	12 ( 11.9)	6 ( 7.4)	11 ( 15.7)	9 ( 12.7)
Fifth Dist.	10 ( 38.5)	17 ( 27.9)	40 ( 39.6)	19 ( 23.5)	20 ( 28.6)	22 ( 31.0)
TOTAL	26 (100.0)	61 (100.0)	101 (100.0)	81 (100.0)	70 (100.0)	71 (100.0)

SUP. DIST.	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
First Dist.	8 ( 8.3)	5 ( 4.3)	4 ( 3.6)	4 ( 3.2)	51 ( 6.0)
Second Dist.	17 ( 17.9)	17 ( 14.8)	21 ( 18.9)	14 ( 11.2)	101 ( 11.8)
Third Dist.	37 ( 39.0)	50 ( 43.5)	43 ( 38.8)	37 ( 29.6)	344 ( 40.2)
Fourth Dist.	16 ( 16.9)	4 ( 3.5)	11 ( 9.9)	20 ( 16.0)	94 ( 11.0)
Fifth Dist.	17 ( 17.9)	39 ( 33.9)	32 ( 28.8)	50 ( 40.0)	266 ( 31.0)
TOTAL	95 (100.0)	115 (100.0)	111 (100.0)	125 (100.0)	856 (100.0)

\* All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

## The Manifestations of Religious Bigotry

People found numerous methods of expressing their religious bigotry during the 1980's. In all years, graffiti vandalism was the most common form of religious hate crime. Perpetrators used easily accessible, inexpensive cans of spray paint in nearly two-thirds of all religious hate crimes documented by the Commission during the decade.

However, non-graffiti property vandalism, graffiti plus other vandalism, arson, criminal threats, assault, cross-burning, disruption of religious services, and desecration of religious objects also occurred with some regularity. The most unusual of all religious hate crimes occurred in 1989, when an act of "air piracy" was committed by an individual who disrupted Westside Super Bowl coverage with a five minute audio interruption, which consisted of a tirade against Jews.

The following chart shows the distribution of all types of religious hate crime recorded by the Commission in the 1980's:

### RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

MANIFESTATION	1980 (%) <sup>*</sup>	1981 (%)	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Graffiti/Hate Literature	11 ( 42.3)	44 ( 72.2)	76 ( 75.2)	56 ( 69.2)	48 ( 68.6)	43 ( 60.0)
Non-Graffiti Vandalism	4 ( 15.4)	5 ( 8.2)	6 ( 5.9)	17 ( 21.0)	8 ( 11.4)	9 ( 12.7)
Graffiti Plus Other Vandalism	6 ( 23.1)	7 ( 11.5)	10 ( 10.0)	3 ( 3.7)	7 ( 10.0)	9 ( 12.7)
Arson/Attempted Arson	4 ( 15.4)	3 ( 4.9)	6 ( 5.9)	4 ( 4.9)	5 ( 7.2)	5 ( 7.0)
Criminal Threats	1 ( 3.8)	1 ( 1.6)	1 ( 1.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.4)	2 ( 2.8)
Assault/Attempted Assault	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.6)	1 ( 1.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.4)	3 ( 4.2)
Cross-Burning/Attempted Cross-Burning	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.0)	1 ( 1.2)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Service Disruption/Desecration	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Air Piracy	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26 (100.0)</b>	<b>61 (100.0)</b>	<b>101 (100.0)</b>	<b>81 (100.0)</b>	<b>70 (100.0)</b>	<b>71 (100.0)</b>

MANIFESTATION	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Graffiti/Hate Literature	60 ( 63.2)	75 ( 65.3)	75 ( 67.6)	70 ( 56.0)	358 ( 65.2)
Non-Graffiti Vandalism	21 ( 22.0)	17 ( 14.8)	5 ( 4.5)	9 ( 7.2)	101 ( 11.8)
Graffiti Plus Other Vandalism	6 ( 6.3)	16 ( 13.9)	8 ( 7.2)	7 ( 5.6)	79 ( 9.2)
Arson/Attempted Arson	6 ( 6.3)	2 ( 1.7)	4 ( 3.6)	4 ( 3.2)	43 ( 5.0)
Criminal Threats	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	14 ( 12.6)	19 ( 15.2)	39 ( 4.6)
Assault/Attempted Assault	1 ( 1.1)	2 ( 1.7)	3 ( 2.7)	11 ( 8.8)	23 ( 2.7)
Cross-Burning/Attempted Cross-Burning	1 ( 1.1)	1 ( 0.8)	1 ( 0.9)	1 ( 0.8)	6 ( 0.7)
Service Disruption/Desecration	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 1.7)	1 ( 0.9)	3 ( 2.4)	6 ( 0.7)
Air Piracy	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.8)	1 ( 0.1)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95 (100.0)</b>	<b>115 (100.0)</b>	<b>111 (100.0)</b>	<b>125 (100.0)</b>	<b>856 (100.0)</b>

\* All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

#### IV. RACIALLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME

Soon after releasing its report on religiously motivated hate crime in January of 1981, the Commission received its first reports of similar acts motivated by racial prejudice.

Just as the earliest religious hate crimes reported to the Commission were all directed at Jews, racial hate crimes reported in 1981 were all directed at Blacks. And, like Jews, Blacks have continued to be the principal target of racial hate crimes throughout the 1980's.

However, victim diversity was soon reported, as the Commission recorded Black and Latino victims in 1982, and Black, Latino, and Asian victims during 1983.

As the decade progressed, diversity continued to expand, and during the last half of the 1980's the Commission recorded hate crimes directed at Blacks, Latinos, Asians, Arabs, multi-racial targets, Armenians, Whites, and Iranians. The rapid diversification of hate crime victims also coincided with the sudden increase in the number of recorded hate crimes between 1986 and the present.

In 1989, for the first time, Commission-documented racial hate crimes outnumbered hate crimes motivated by religious bigotry. Reported racial incidents had climbed from the 4 such acts documented by the Commission in 1981 to the 167 recorded in 1989.

The following chart provides a breakdown of racial hate crimes reported to the Commission during the 1980's:

##### RACIALLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

RACE	1981 (%)	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Black	4 (100.0)	13 (86.7)	8 (72.7)	9 (69.2)	9 (69.2)
Asian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 (18.2)	3 (23.1)	2 (15.4)
Latino	0 ( 0.0)	2 (13.3)	1 ( 9.1)	0 ( 0.0)	2 (15.4)
Arab	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 7.7)	0 ( 0.0)
Armenian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Combination	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Other White	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
Iranian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4 (100.0)</b>	<b>13 (100.0)</b>	<b>11 (100.0)</b>	<b>13 (100.0)</b>	<b>13 (100.0)</b>

  

RACE	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Black	40 (69.0)	41 (51.9)	62 (65.3)	96 (57.5)	282 ( 62.0)
Asian	14 (24.1)	15 (19.0)	13 (13.7)	19 (11.3)	68 ( 14.9)
Latino	3 ( 5.2)	14 (17.7)	8 ( 8.4)	22 (13.2)	52 ( 11.4)
Arab	1 ( 1.7)	3 ( 3.8)	7 ( 7.4)	7 ( 4.2)	19 ( 4.2)
Armenian	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 2.5)	3 ( 3.1)	10 ( 6.0)	15 ( 3.3)
Combination	0 ( 0.0)	4 ( 5.1)	0 ( 0.0)	5 ( 3.0)	9 ( 1.9)
Other White	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 2.1)	4 ( 3.6)	8 ( 1.9)
Iranian	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 1.2)	2 ( 0.4)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58 (100.0)</b>	<b>79 (100.0)</b>	<b>95 (100.0)</b>	<b>167 (100.0)</b>	<b>455 (100.0)</b>

§ All percentages rounded

to nearest .1 percent

## Sites of Racial Hate Crimes

As with religious hate crimes, residences were the primary site of racial hate crimes in every year, with residential hate crimes accounting for over 70 percent of these acts during the 1980's. Until 1983, residences were the only racial hate crime sites reported to the Commission, but in that year the Commission also documented attacks upon minority owned businesses.

By 1984 residences, businesses and schools reported hate crimes, and in 1986 the Commission recorded a racially motivated assault which occurred in a public place. It was not until 1989 that any other hate crime sites were reported. In that year the Commission documented hate crimes perpetrated upon both ethnic organizations and ethnic churches.

The sites of racial hate crimes documented by the Commission in the 1980's, including percentages for each year and for the full decade, are broken down in the chart below:

### RACIALLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

TARGET/SITE	1981 (%)*	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Residence/Auto	4 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	9 (81.9)	7 (53.8)	8 (61.5)
Business	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 18.2)	2 ( 15.4)	2 ( 15.4)
Public Place	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
School	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	4 ( 30.8)	3 ( 23.1)
Ethnic Org./Church	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)
TOTAL	4 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	13 (100.0)	13 (100.0)

TARGET/SITE	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Residence/Auto	44 ( 75.9)	61 ( 77.2)	63 ( 66.3)	112 ( 67.1)	323 ( 71.0)
Business	12 ( 20.7)	7 ( 8.9)	21 ( 22.1)	17 ( 10.2)	63 ( 13.8)
Public Place	2 ( 3.4)	3 ( 3.8)	5 ( 5.3)	23 ( 13.7)	33 ( 7.3)
School	0 ( 0.0)	8 ( 10.1)	6 ( 6.3)	11 ( 6.6)	32 ( 7.0)
Ethnic Org./Church	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	4 ( 2.4)	4 ( 0.9)
TOTAL	58 (100.0)	79 (100.0)	95 (100.0)	167 (100.0)	455 (100.0)

\*All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

Every County area experienced racial hate crime in the 1980's; no area was unaffected. The same areas which had the highest levels of religious hate crime also suffered the greatest number of racially motivated acts. The Commission believes that the great ethnic diversity in both the Third and the Fifth Supervisorial Districts provided perpetrators with the largest concentration of targets. Additionally, these areas experienced some of the County's most rapid, visible, demographic change, including the dramatic increases in both the Soviet Armenian and the Asian populations.

The following provides a statistical breakdown of racial hate crimes, by Supervisorial District, documented by the Commission in the 1980's:

#### RACIALLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

SUP. DIST.	1981 (%)*	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
First Dist.	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 20.0)	4 ( 36.4)	2 ( 15.4)	0 ( 0.0)
Second Dist.	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 6.7)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 23.1)	3 ( 23.4)
Third Dist.	2 ( 50.0)	3 ( 20.0)	4 ( 36.4)	4 ( 30.7)	2 ( 15.4)
Fourth Dist.	2 ( 50.0)	5 ( 33.3)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 15.4)	3 ( 23.1)
Fifth Dist.	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 20.0)	3 ( 27.2)	2 ( 15.4)	5 ( 38.4)
TOTAL	4 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	13 (100.0)	13 (100.0)

SUP. DIST.	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
First Dist.	3 ( 5.2)	4 ( 5.1)	4 ( 4.2)	17 ( 10.2)	37 ( 8.1)
Second Dist.	18 ( 31.0)	13 ( 16.5)	16 ( 16.8)	19 ( 11.3)	73 ( 16.0)
Third Dist.	7 ( 12.1)	31 ( 39.2)	30 ( 31.6)	45 ( 27.0)	128 ( 28.2)
Fourth Dist.	7 ( 12.1)	4 ( 5.1)	15 ( 15.8)	38 ( 22.8)	76 ( 16.7)
Fifth Dist.	23 ( 39.6)	27 ( 34.1)	30 ( 31.6)	48 ( 28.7)	141 ( 31.0)
TOTAL	58 (100.)	79 (100.0)	95 (100.0)	288 (100.0)	455 (100.0)

\* All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

## The Manifestations of Racial Bigotry

While two-thirds of the decade's religious hate crime was graffiti vandalism, this type of crime accounted for only 45 percent of racial attacks. Also in contrast to religious hate crimes, where the number of assaults was relatively low, racially motivated assaults constituted over one-quarter of such crimes, with assaults grounded in racial bigotry occurring every year from 1982 until 1989.

In recent years, the Commission saw a disturbing increase in both the number and the percentage of racially motivated assaults. In fact, during 1989 the Commission recorded 54 acts of racially motivated graffiti, and 53 racial assaults.

Other expressions of racial bigotry included non-graffiti property vandalism, graffiti combined with other acts of vandalism, criminal threats, cross-burnings, and arson.

The following chart shows the types of hate crimes documented by the Commission during the decade:

### RACIALLY MOTIVATED HATE CRIME BREAKDOWN

MANIFESTATION	1981 (%)*	1982 (%)	1983 (%)	1984 (%)	1985 (%)
Graffiti/Hate Literature	4 (100.0)	8 (53.3)	6 (54.3)	2 (15.4)	7 (53.8)
Assault/Attempted Assault	0 (0.0)	1 (6.7)	1 (9.1)	5 (38.4)	1 (7.7)
Non-Graffiti Vandalism	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	1 (9.1)	2 (15.4)	1 (7.7)
Graffiti Plus Other Vandalism	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (9.1)	3 (23.1)	1 (7.7)
Criminal Threats	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Cross-Burning	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (7.7)	2 (15.4)
Arson/Attempted Arson	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (18.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (7.7)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4 (100.0)</b>	<b>15 (100.0)</b>	<b>11 (100.0)</b>	<b>13 (100.0)</b>	<b>13 (100.0)</b>

MANIFESTATION	1986 (%)	1987 (%)	1988 (%)	1989 (%)	TOTAL (%)
Graffiti/Hate Literature	32 (55.2)	47 (59.5)	48 (50.5)	54 (32.3)	208 (45.8)
Assault/Attempted Assault	11 (19.0)	19 (24.1)	23 (24.2)	53 (31.8)	114 (25.1)
Non-Graffiti Vandalism	10 (17.3)	8 (10.1)	11 (11.6)	22 (13.2)	58 (12.7)
Graffiti Plus Other Vandalism	2 (3.4)	3 (3.8)	4 (4.2)	12 (7.2)	26 (5.7)
Criminal Threats	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	19 (11.3)	26 (5.7)
Cross-Burning	1 (1.7)	2 (2.5)	2 (2.1)	6 (3.6)	17 (3.7)
Arson/Attempted Arson	2 (3.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)	6 (1.3)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58 (100.0)</b>	<b>79 (100.0)</b>	<b>95 (100.0)</b>	<b>167 (100.0)</b>	<b>455 (100.0)</b>

\* All percentages rounded to nearest .1 percent

## V. SEXUAL ORIENTATION HATE CRIME

As noted earlier in this report, the Commission began monitoring sexual orientation hate crimes in 1987. Therefore, no long-term data about these acts are available. However, the Commission is able to draw some conclusions about homophobic hate crime from existing information.

Like racially and religiously motivated hate crime, crimes motivated by sexual orientation also appear to be increasing. The figures rose from the 61 such acts documented by the Commission in 1988 to 86 in 1989.

Gay men report many more hate crimes than do Lesbians. The Commission believes that this is due in part because the perpetrators are predominantly male and more virulently biased against Gay men, and because Gay male enclaves in neighborhoods such as West Hollywood and Silverlake are more easily identifiable.

Sexual orientation victims for the past two years break down as follows:

<u>Sex of Victim</u>	<u>1988 (%)</u>	<u>1989 (%)</u>	<u>TOTAL (%)</u> *
Gay Male	57 ( 93.4)	80 ( 93.0)	137 ( 93.2)
Lesbian Female	4 ( 6.6)	6 ( 7.0)	10 ( 6.8)
Total	61 (100.0)	86 (100.0)	147 (100.0)

\* rounded to nearest .1 percent

### Sites of Sexual Orientation Hate Crimes

As with hate crimes motivated by race or religion, those related to sexual orientation occurred most often at residences. Residences were the most frequent hate crime site in both 1988 and 1989. Public places and businesses were also the scenes of several hate crimes in both years, and in 1989 one such act occurred on a school campus, as indicated below:

<u>Site of Hate Crime</u>	<u>1988 (%)</u>	<u>1989 (%)</u>	<u>TOTAL (%)</u> *
Residence	34 ( 55.7)	37 ( 43.0)	71 ( 48.3)
Public Place	11 ( 18.1)	29 ( 33.7)	40 ( 27.2)
Business	16 ( 26.2)	19 ( 22.1)	35 ( 23.8)
School	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 1.2)	1 ( 0.7)
Total	61 (100.0)	86 (100.0)	147 (100.0)

\* rounded to nearest .1 percent

Although many County areas experienced anti-Gay and Lesbian hate crimes during those two years, the overwhelming majority occurred in the West Hollywood, Hollywood, and Silverlake areas. These all lie within the Third Supervisorial District. Hate crime distribution, by Supervisorial District, follows:

<u>Supervisorial District</u>	<u>1988 (%)</u>	<u>1989 (%)</u>	<u>TOTAL (%)</u> *
First District	1 ( 1.6)	2 ( 2.3)	3 ( 2.0)
Second District	5 ( 8.2)	4 ( 4.7)	9 ( 6.1)
Third District	47 ( 77.1)	67 ( 77.9)	114 ( 77.6)
Fourth District	3 ( 4.9)	4 ( 4.7)	7 ( 4.8)
Fifth District	5 ( 8.2)	9 ( 10.4)	14 ( 9.5)
Total	61 (100.0)	86 (100.0)	147 (100.0)

\* rounded to nearest .1 percent

#### Types of Sexual Orientation Hate Crime

Assaults accounted for nearly two-thirds of all homophobic hate crime, giving a disturbing accuracy to the term "Gay bashing," which is commonly used to describe these acts. Several assaults have resulted in serious injury to the victims, and some of them suffered long-term disability from the attacks.

Graffiti vandalism was the second most frequent manifestation of anti-Gay and Lesbian bias. Criminal threats, non-graffiti property vandalism, arson, and graffiti combined with additional vandalism were also documented by the Commission.

Types of hate crimes recorded by the Commission during the past two years are as shown below:

<u>Hate Crime Type</u>	<u>1988 (%)</u>	<u>1989 (%)</u>	<u>TOTAL (%)</u> *
Assault	39 ( 64.0)	54 ( 62.8)	93 ( 63.3)
Graffiti	16 ( 26.2)	26 ( 30.2)	42 ( 28.6)
Criminal Threats	2 ( 3.3)	3 ( 3.5)	5 ( 3.4)
Non-graffiti Vandalism	2 ( 3.3)	2 ( 2.3)	4 ( 2.7)
Arson/Bombing	1 ( 1.6)	1 ( 1.2)	2 ( 1.3)
Graffiti Plus Vandalism	1 ( 1.6)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.7)

\* rounded to nearest .1 percent

The Commission notes that, due to the limited number of reporting sources, and the early stage of data gathering efforts, the number of anti-Gay and Lesbian hate crimes may be significantly underreported.

#### VI. HATE CRIME TRENDS IN THE 80's

The most obvious hate crime trend of the 1980's was its ongoing, ever-increasing level, which was especially dramatic in the last half of the decade.

Religious incidents rose from the 26 recorded by the Commission in 1980 to 125 in 1989. Racial hate crimes escalated from 4 reported incidents in 1981 to 167 in 1989. Even the Commission's most recent information-gathering efforts in the Gay and Lesbian community yielded an increase from the 61 hate crimes documented in 1988 to the 86 reported in 1989.

The word "diversity" applies not only to the demographic profile of Los Angeles County, but also to the County's victims of hate crime.

During the 1980's, religiously motivated acts were directed at 18 different faiths. These ranged from hundreds of attacks on Jewish targets to single episodes directed at other religious groups.

Racial hate crime victims also reflected the tremendous diversity of the County, as 7 different racial and ethnic groups were targeted. Again, these ran the gamut from numerous attacks on Black victims to a pair of acts aimed at Iranians.

Specific ethnic groups appeared to become victims due to their sudden visibility. Asians, the victims of only 2 documented hate crimes in 1983, experienced 19 such attacks in 1989. The number of anti-Asian hate crimes has risen along with the population, and these were reported in areas of Asian growth. Likewise the Soviet Armenian community, especially in Glendale and Hollywood, has experienced explosive growth since the U.S.S.R. opened the door for emigrants. Until 1987, the Commission recorded no anti-Armenian hate crimes, but has recorded 15 such acts in recent years.

Despite the increasing diversity of hate crime victims during the 1980's, it is important to note that over 90 percent of the decade's religious hate crimes were directed at Jews, and nearly two-thirds of all racial hate crimes were directed at Blacks. The Commission believes that anti-Jewish and anti-Black bigotry are perhaps the most firmly entrenched forms of prejudice in our society, and expects that these two groups will continue to constitute the majority of hate crime victims during the 1990's.

The Commission is particularly disturbed by the trend toward increasingly violent expressions of bigotry. Assaults, unheard of in the early 1980's, now constitute over one-quarter of all racially motivated hate crime and nearly two-thirds of crimes motivated by sexual orientation.

Assault is the most personal of all attacks, and its effects may linger for years. Not only do assault victims report injuries and immediate feelings of violation, many report ongoing fears for their personal safety and the safety of their families.

However, not all of the hate crime trends of the 1980's are negative. The Commission has also observed some important, positive trends during the decade.

Foremost among these is the trend toward improved reporting by victims, community organizations, and law enforcement agencies. The Commission believes

that this accounts for a portion of the increase in reported incidents. However, the Commission also believes that crimes motivated by bigotry are, in fact, on the rise.

Another positive trend noted by the Commission is the adoption by numerous law enforcement agencies of specific hate crime policies and procedures. This has enabled law enforcement officers to more easily make a correct identification of hate crimes, and to treat hate crime victims with sensitivity.

The Commission has also noted an increase in the percentage of hate crimes resulting in arrests in recent years. Greater awareness of hate crime by law enforcement, and improved victim reporting, are seen by the Commission as significant factors contributing to this trend.

There is also an increasing level of public awareness of hate crime. The media have focused a great deal of attention on hate crime, and a number of community groups are now attempting to develop ways of coping with it. This may soon result in the wider availability of support services for victims, especially in ethnic immigrant and other under-served communities, where services have been lacking.

## VII. THE FUTURE: HATE CRIME IN THE 90's

Resistance to change appears to be inherent in human nature, and the Commission believes that rapid ethnic demographic change is one of the most significant factors in the rising level of hate crimes during the 1980's.

The Commission believes that such change will continue throughout the 1990's and well beyond the year 2000. Changes in Eastern Europe, ongoing problems in Central and South America, and the reversion of Hong Kong to Chinese Communist control in 1997 are all expected to yield their share of immigrants to this County.

And as these diverse peoples leave their home countries, a large percentage will settle here in Los Angeles County. They will bring with them energy, creativity, and personal resources which benefit our society. They will also arrive with new languages, customs, foods, and values, traits which may serve to provoke hostility in those fearful of change.

As noted earlier in this report, anti-Jewish and anti-Black bigotry appear to be deeply entrenched among a small segment of society. Thus, while neither the Commission nor other sources anticipate significant growth in these populations, the Commission believes that an early decline in these forms of bigotry and their attendant hate crimes is unlikely.

The Commission also believes that international events will play a continuing role in hate crimes, especially those aimed at Arabs, other Middle Eastern targets, and Islamic victims.

Despite these problems, the Human Relations Commission believes that with the support of elected officials, law enforcement, community groups, and people of good will, we will ultimately look back on this period of hate crime as an aberrant episode in our social history.



U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124899293